
SDMS US EPA REGION V -1

**SOME IMAGES WITHIN THIS
DOCUMENT MAY BE ILLEGIBLE
DUE TO BAD SOURCE
DOCUMENTS.**

Facility Name: CAHOKIA / DEAD CREEK

Location: SAUGET, IL. (ST CLAIR COUNTY)

EPA Region: 5

Person(s) in Charge of the Facility: _____

Name of Reviewer: C. E. Mays III Date: 7/20/82

General Description of the Facility:

(For example: landfill, surface impoundment, pile, container; types of hazardous substances; location of the facility; contamination route of major concern; types of information needed for rating; agency action, etc.)

Unlined creek bed - the surrounding area had several
landfills operating in the creek's vicinity since 1927 to
the 1960's. Site is surrounded on the north by several
large companies which have been operating since the 1900's.

Scores: $S_M = \frac{18.48}{8.70}$ ($S_{gw} = 4.24$ $S_{sw} = 7.55$ $S_a = \frac{30.77}{12.51}$)

$S_{FE} = 30.00$

$S_{DC} = 50.00$

J.3
 7/20/82
 153493

Figure 1

HRS COVER SHEET

QC
 Math error under
 air pathway
 attached 8/20/82
 225- 2/1/82

GROUND WATER ROUTE WORK SHEET						
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)	
1 OBSERVED RELEASE	0 (45)	1	45	45	3.1	
If observed release is given a score of 45, proceed to line 4. If observed release is given a score of 0, proceed to line 2.						
2 ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS					3.2	
Depth to Aquifer of Concern	0 1 2 3	2		6		
Net Precipitation	0 1 2 3	1		3		
Permeability of the Unsaturated Zone	0 1 2 3	1		3		
Physical State	0 1 2 3	1		3		
Total Route Characteristics Score			N/A	15		
3 CONTAINMENT	0 1 2 3	1	N/A	3	3.3	
4 WASTE CHARACTERISTICS					3.4	
Toxicity/Persistence	0 3 6 9 12 15 (18)	1	18	18		
Hazardous Waste Quantity	(0) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1	0	8		
Total Waste Characteristics Score			18	26		
5 TARGETS					3.5	
Ground Water Use	0 (1) 2 3	3	3	9		
Distance to Nearest Well/Population Served	(0) 4 6 8 10 12 16 18 20 24 30 32 35 40	1	0	40		
Total Targets Score			3	49		
6	If line 1 is 45, multiply 1 x 4 x 5 If line 1 is 0, multiply 2 x 3 x 4 x 5			57,330		
7	Divide line 6 by 57,330 and multiply by 100		$S_{gw} = 4.24$			

Figure 2

Ground Water Route Work Sheet

10

$$45 \times 18 \times 3 = 2430 = GW$$

$$\frac{GW}{57330} \times 100 = 4.24$$

SURFACE WATER ROUTE WORK SHEET						
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)	
1 OBSERVED RELEASE	0 (45)	1	45	45	4.1	
If observed release is given a value of 45, proceed to line 4. If observed release is given a value of 0, proceed to line 2.						
2 ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS					4.2	
Facility Slope and Intervening Terrain	0 1 2 3	1		3		
1-yr. 24-hr. Rainfall	0 1 2 3	1		3		
Distance to Nearest Surface Water	0 1 2 3	2		6		
Physical State	0 1 2 3	1		3		
Total Route Characteristics Score			N/A	15		
3 CONTAINMENT	0 1 2 3	1	N/A	3	4.3	
4 WASTE CHARACTERISTICS					4.4	
Toxicity/Persistence	0 3 6 9 12 15 (18)	1	18	18		
Hazardous Waste Quantity	(0) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1	0	8		
Total Waste Characteristics Score			18	26		
5 TARGETS					4.5	
Surface Water Use	0 1 (2) 3	3	6	9		
Distance to a Sensitive Environment	(0) 1 2 3	2	0	6		
Population Served/Distance to Water Intake Downstream	(0) 4 6 8 10 12 16 18 20 24 30 32 35 40	1	0	40		
Total Targets Score			6	55		
6 If line 1 is 45, multiply 1 x 4 x 5 If line 1 is 0, multiply 2 x 3 x 4 x 5				64,350		
7 Divide line 5 by 64,350 and multiply by 100			S _{sw} = 7.55			

Figure 7

Surface Water Route Work Sheet

28

$$45 \times 18 \times 6 = 4860 = SW$$

$$\frac{SW}{64350} \times 100 = 7.55$$

AIR ROUTE WORK SHEET						
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)	
1 OBSERVED RELEASE	0 <u>45</u>	1	45	45	5.1	
Date and Location: 3/23/82 Northern Dead Creek						
Sampling Protocol: Check for spots above background 2- HNU photo-ionizers & 1- OVA						
If line 1 is 0, then S = 0. Enter on line 6 . If line 1 is 45, then proceed to line 2 .						
2 WASTE CHARACTERISTICS				5.2		
Reactivity and Incompatibility	<u>0</u> 1 2 3	1	1	3		
Toxicity	0 1 2 <u>3</u>	3	2 9	9		
Hazardous Waste Quantity	<u>0</u> 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1	0	8		
			10			
Total Waste Characteristics Score			4	20		
3 TARGETS				5.3		
Population Within 4-Mile Radius	0 9 12 15 18 } <u>21</u> 24 27 30	1	21	30		
Distance to Sensitive Environment	<u>0</u> 1 2 3	2	0	6		
Land Use	0 1 2 <u>3</u>	1	3	3		
Total Targets Score			24	39		
4 Multiply 1 x 2 x 3				35,100		
5 Divide line 4 by 35,100 and multiply by 100			S _a = <u>12.31</u>			

Figure 9

Air Route Work Sheet

$$\begin{aligned}
 & 10 = 10000 \quad 38 \\
 & 45 \times 4 \times 24 = 4320 = A \\
 & \frac{A}{35100} \times 100 = 12.31
 \end{aligned}$$

	S	S ²
Groundwater Route Score (S _{gw})	4.24	17.98
Surface Water Route Score (S _{sw})	7.55	57.00
Air Route Score (S _a)	12.37 36.78	946.60 151.54
S _{gw} ² + S _{sw} ² + S _a ²		1021.78 226.52
$\sqrt{S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_a^2}$		31.97 15.05
$\sqrt{S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_a^2} / 1.73$		18.48 S _M = 8.70

Figure 10
WORKSHEET FOR COMPUTING S_M

FIRE AND EXPLOSION WORK SHEET					
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi- plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)
1 Containment	1 (3)	1	3	3	7.1
2 Waste Characteristics					7.2
Direct Evidence	0 (3)	1	3	3	
Ignitability	0 1 2 (3)	1	3	3	
Reactivity	0 (1) 2 3	1	1	3	
Incompatibility	0 (1) 2 3	1	1	3	
Hazardous Waste Quantity	(0) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1	0	8	
Total Waste Characteristics Score			8	20	
3 Targets					7.3
Distance to Nearest Population	0 1 2 (3) 4 5	1	3	5	
Distance to Nearest Building	0 1 (2) 3	1	2	3	
Distance to Sensitive Environment	(0) 1 2 3	1	0	3	
Land Use	0 1 2 (3)	1	3	3	
Population Within 2-Mile Radius	0 1 2 3 4 (5)	1	5	5	
Buildings Within 2-Mile Radius	0 1 2 3 4 (5)	1	5	5	
Total Target Score			18	24	
4 Multiply [1] x [2] x [3]				1,440	
5 Divide line [5] by 1,440 and multiply by 100			SFE = 30.0		

Figure 11
Fire and Explosion Work Sheet

48

$$3 \times 8 \times 18 = 432 = FE$$

$$\frac{FE}{1440} \times 100 = 30$$

DIRECT CONTACT WORK SHEET						
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi- plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)	
1 Observed Incident	0 (45)	1	45	45	8.1	
If line 1 is 45, proceed to line 4 If line 1 is 0, proceed to line 2						
2 Accessibility	0 1 2 3	1		3	8.2	
3 Containment	0 15	1		15	8.3	
4 Waste Characteristics Toxicity	0 1 2 (3)	5	15	15	8.4	
5 Targets					8.5	
Population within a 1-mile radius	0 1 2 3 (4) 5	4	16	20		
Distance to a critical habitat	(0) 2 3	4	0	12		
Total Targets Score			16	32		
6 If line 1 is 45, multiply 1 x 4 x 5; If line 1 is 0, multiply 2 x 3 x 4 x 5				21,600		
7 Divide line 6 by 21,600 and multiply by 100			SDC = 50			

$$45 \times 15 \times 16 = 10900 = DC$$

$$\frac{DC}{21600} \times 100 = 50$$

Figure 12
Direct Contact Work Sheet

DOCUMENTATION RECORDS
FOR
HAZARD RANKING SYSTEM

INSTRUCTIONS: The purpose of these records is to provide a convenient way to prepare an auditable record of the data and documentation used to apply the Hazard Ranking System to a given site. The source of information should be provided for each entry and should be a bibliographic-type reference that will allow anyone to find the document used for a given data point. Include the location of the document and consider appending a copy of the relevant page(s) for ease in review by any interested party.

FACILITY NAME:

CAHOKIA / DEAD CREEK

LOCATION:

SAUGET, IL. (ST. CLAIR COUNTY)

1 OBSERVED RELEASE

Contaminants detected off site (5 maximum):

PCB's, chloroaniline, dichlorobenzene, copper, manganese, lead, cyclohexane, chlorophenol, aliphatic hydrocarbons, silver, nickel, arsenic, cadmium, phosphorus

Reasoning by which the presence of the detected contaminants can be attributed to the facility:

Found in IEPA monitoring wells surrounding the site

Wastes corresponds to waste of several industries in the area

Site is surrounded by various industries

SOURCE: "A Preliminary Hydrogeologic Investigation in the Northern Portion of Dead Creek & Vicinity" By Ron St. John, 4/81, IEPA Report
* * *
pp. 34-39

2 ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS

Depth to Aquifer of Concern

Name/description of aquifer(s) of concern:

NOT APPLICABLE (N/A) - OBSERVED RELEASE (O.R.)

Depth(s) from the ground surface to the highest seasonal level of the saturated zone [water table(s)] of the aquifer of concern:

N/A - O.R.

Depth from the ground surface to the lowest point of waste disposal/storage:

N/A - O.R.

Net Precipitation

Mean annual or seasonal precipitation:

N/A - O.R.

Mean annual lake or seasonal evaporation:

N/A - O.R.

Net precipitation (subtract the above figures):

N/A - O.R.

Permeability of Unsaturated Zone

Soil type in unsaturated zone:

N/A - O.R.

Permeability associated with soil type:

N/A - O.R.

Physical State

Physical state of waste at time of disposal (or generated gases):

N/A - O.R.

* * *

3 CONTAINMENT

Containment

Method(s) of waste or leachate containment evaluated:

N/A - O.R.

Method with highest score:

N/A - O.R.

4 WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Toxicity and Persistence.

Compound(s) evaluated:

	TOXICITY	PERSISTENCE
PCB's	3	3
Chloroaniline	3	1
dichloro benzene	2	2
cyclohexane	2	2

Compound with highest score:

SOURCE: SAY & NFPA DATA

SCORES A (18)

Hazardous Waste Quantity

Total quantity of hazardous waste at the facility (excluding those with a containment score of 0):

UNKNOWN - AREA HAS BEEN USED AS SEVERAL LANDFILLS
SINCE 1937 AND NO RECORDS ON AMOUNT HAS BEEN KEPT

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

SOURCE: "A Preliminary Hydrogeologic Investigation in the
Northern Portion of Dead Creek & Vicinity"
By Ron St John, 4/81, DEPA Report

SCORES A (0)

Ground Water Use

Use(s) of aquifer(s) of concern within a 3-mile radius of the facility:

Industrial / Commercial - SOURCE: IL. STATE WATER SURVEY

Mississippi River is major water source in the area

Distance to Nearest Well

Location of nearest well drawing from aquifer of concern or occupied

Building not served by a public water supply:

< 2000 ft : Monsanto well upgradient to GW flow but causes
cone of depression in water table → contaminated well

Distance to above well or building:

< 2000 ft. SCORES A (4)

Population Served by Ground Water Wells Within a 3-Mile Radius

Identified public-supply well(s) drawing from aquifer(s) of concern
within a 3-mile radius:

• NONE

Private - industrial →

Truck Supply Inc. → used bottled H₂O
for drinking
Ammex
Cerro Corp

Population served by each above public-supply well and how computed:

PSW - 0

SOURCE: ISWS

Computation of land area irrigated by supply well(s) drawing from
aquifer(s) of concern within a 3-mile radius, and conversion to
population (1.5 people per acre):

N/A

Total population served by ground water within a 3-mile radius:

0
Industrial use only

SCORES A (0)

1 OBSERVED RELEASE

Contaminants detected in surface water at the facility or downhill from it (5 maximum):

— PCB's, Chloroaniline, dichlorobenzene, cyclohexane,
Chlorophenol

Reasoning by which the presence of the detected contaminants can be attributed to the facility: the

Contaminants deposited directly into waters - Lab. analysis of creek downstream & certain company holding ponds show waste analysis of the same type

SOURCE: ST. JOHN'S REPORT

2 ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS

Facility Slope and Intervening Terrain

Average slope of facility in percent:

N/A - O.R.

Name/description of nearest downslope surface water:

N/A - O.R.

Average slope of terrain between facility and above-cited surface water body in percent:

N/A - O.R.

Is the facility located either totally or partially in surface water?

N/A - O.R.

Is the facility completely surrounded by areas of high elevation?

N/A - O.R.

1-Year 24-Hour Rainfall in Inches

N/A - O.R.

Distance to Nearest Downslope Surface Water

N/A - O.R.

Physical State of Waste

N/A - O.R.

* * *

3 CONTAINMENT

Containment

Method(s) of waste or leachate containment evaluated:

N/A - O.R.

Method with highest score:

N/A - O.R.

4 WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Refer to Ground Water Route

* * *

5 TARGETS

Surface Water Use

Use(s) of surface water within 3 miles downstream of the hazardous substance:

Recreation - children play in creek

SCORES A (2)

Is there tidal influence?

No

Distance to a Sensitive Environment

Distance to 5-acre (minimum) coastal wetland, if 2 miles or less:

> 2 mile

Distance to 5-acre (minimum) fresh-water wetland, if 1 mile or less:

> 1 mile

Distance to critical habitat of an endangered species or national wildlife refuge, if 1 mile or less:

> 1 mile

SCORES A (0)

Population Served by Surface Water

Location(s) of public-supply intake(s) within 3 miles (free-flowing bodies) or 1 mile (static water bodies) downstream of the hazardous substance:

None

Population served by each above public-supply intake:

None

Computation of land area irrigated by above-cited intake(s) and conversion to population (1.5 people per acre):

N/A

Total population served:

0

Name/description of nearest of above water bodies:

Dead Creek

Distance to above-cited intakes, measured in stream miles.

N/A

TOTAL: SCORES A (A)

1 OBSERVED RELEASE

Contaminants detected:

— No specifics - just a survey to get a plus or minus reading (check for spots above background)

Source: FIT memo 4/14/82 by Don Woods

Date and location of detection of contaminants

3/23/82

North end of Dead Creek - just south of Queensy Ave.

Methods used to detect the contaminants:

Organic Vapor Analyzer
 2 - HNU photo-ionizer 10.2 ev lamp
 11.7 ev lamp
 Explosimeter, Radiation Survey meter, O₂ Indicator

Reasoning by which the presence of the detected contaminants can be attributed to the site:

- Absorption of contaminants with the soil, a buried pipe was found entering the creek with a turbid & oily liquid coming from it. Midwest Rubber use to pipe their waste into the creek (creek bed is spongy when you walk on it)

* * *

2 WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Reactivity and Incompatibility

Three most reactive compounds (indicate one used):

Phosphorous

Arsenic

SCORES A (1)

Three most incompatible pairs of compounds (indicate one used):

Toxicity

Three most toxic compounds (indicate one used):

PCB's 3
Dichlorophenol 3
Chloroaniline 3

Hazardous Waste Quantity

Total quantity of hazardous waste:

UNKNOWN

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

* * *

3 TARGETS

Population: Within 4-Mile Radius

Circle radius used, give population, and indicate how determined:

1 to 4 mi 1/2 to 1 mi 1/4 to 1/2 mi 0 to 1/4 mi

6,100 people

Scores A (21)

Distance to a Sensitive Environment

Distance to 5-acre (minimum) coastal wetland, if 2 miles or less:

> 2 miles

Distance to 5-acre (minimum) fresh-water wetland, if 1 mile or less:

> 1 mile

Distance to critical habitat of an endangered species if 1 mile or less:

> 1 mile

SCORES A (0)

Land Use

Distance to commercial/industrial area, if 1 mile or less:

< 1/4 mile (~2000ft) Topo map & FIT inspection

SCORES A (3)

Distance to national or state park, forest, or wildlife reserve, if 2 miles or less:

None

Distance to residential area, if 2 miles or less:

< 1/4 mile Topo map & FIT inspection

SCORES A (2)

Distance to agricultural land in production within past 5 years, if 1 mile or less:

< 1/4 mile Topo map & FIT inspection

SCORES A (2)

Distance to prime agricultural land in production within past 5 years, if 2 miles or less:

< 1/2 mile Topo map & FIT inspection

SCORES A (2)

Is a historic or landmark site (National Register or Historic Places and National Natural Landmarks) within the view of the site?

No - only the St. Louis Arch

FIRE AND EXPLOSION - PICTURES FROM DEPA FILE OF CREEK BED
IN FIRE

CONTAINMENT → WASTE DUMPED WITH NO SEGREGATION
SCORES A (2)

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

DIRECT EVIDENCE → NO MEASUREMENTS, but photographs
of creek bed on fire
SCORES A (2)

IGNITABILITY → SCORES A (2)

	TOXICITY	PERSISTENCE	IGNITABILITY	REACTIVITY
Chlorobenzene	2	2	3	0
Dichlorophenol	3	1	0	0
Chloroaniline	3	1	1	0
PCB	3	3	0	0
Phosphorous	3	1	3	1
Arsenic	2	1	0	1
Cyclohexane	2	2	3	0

SOURCE: SAX AND NFPA DATA

REACTIVITY → SCORES A (1)

INCOMPATIBILITY → SCORES A (1)

HAZ. WASTE QUANTITY → UNKNOWN: SCORES A (0)

TARGETS

DIST. TO NEAREST POP.

201 ft - 2640 ft SCORES A (3)

SOURCE: U.S.G.S. TOPO MAP (DIST ~ 500 ft)

DIST. TO NEAREST BLDG.

51 - 200 ft SCORES A (2)

SOURCE: U.S.G.S. TOPO MAP (DIST ~ 55 ft)

DIST TO SENSITIVE ENVIR. → SCORES A (0)

LAND USE → SCORES A (2) (see air section)

POP. W/IN 2 MILE RADIUS → 12,239: $\frac{1}{8}$ of E St. Louis 51520 bldgs
(E St. Louis: 51700 pop) counted off of map $\times 3.6 \text{ people/bldg}$
 $51700/8 = 6463 \text{ people}$ SCORES A (5)

BLDGs. W/IN 2 MI. RAD. → 1520 counted; $6463/3.6 = 1700$ TOTAL: 3220

DIRECT CONTACT

OBSERVED INCIDENT → Yes, resident's dog rolled in ditch and died of apparent
chemical burns in Aug. 1980 SOURCE: ST JOHN'S REPORT

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS: TOXICITY - PCB's = 3 SCORES A (2)

TARGETS: POP W/IN 1 MI. RAD. - 6,100 SCORES A (4)

DIST. TO CRITICAL HABITAT: SCORES A (0)

1. What information has already been provided to Headquarters?

If the response to any of the questions is readily available in Headquarters so state and give the names and telephone numbers of the people having the information and in what form (memo, report, etc.) it was supplied.

None

2. What is the History/threat of the site?

A short, descriptive narrative of one to two pages is preferred with an appendix of significant dates. Include a list of substances found, or believed to be found on the site (with notations to distinguish the difference) and a short description of the population at risk and/or the environment affected.

Illegal dumping of large amounts of phosphorus in an ephemeral stream has resulted in surface water and soil contamination. Animals exposed to the area have died from the exposure.

3. What detailed studies have been performed on the site?

A short description of each study, with dates performed. The name of the contractor, the project officer (with address and telephone number) and a summary of the findings will be needed. A copy of the final report, or executive summary of each study will be requested to be sent to Headquarters. These studies include hydrogeological studies, soil, water and air monitoring, ground-penetrating radar studies and any others which define the extent of the problem, provide information needed to plan remedial measures and/or provide for a facility plan to completely or partially clean the site.

* Samples from the ditch have been taken, and indicate extremely high levels of phosphorus.

4. What emergency/remedial actions are necessary to clean the site?

These actions are those necessary to completely eliminate or ultimately secure the hazardous materials on or off the site. The description of these measures should be as specific as possible and should reflect the data obtained in the studies supplied in answer to question 3. These actions are not limited to those already approved or underway but should be those that should be performed for a total cleanup of the site. These are, however, generic activities such as "removal of contaminated soil", "repackaging and/or removal of drums", "construction of a leachate collection and treatment system". Include the studies that should be performed in order to better define the remedial activities needed.

The contaminant source must be removed and properly disposed of.

5. What alternative measures have been suggested?

For each activity prescribed in question 4 provide a list of alternative methods considered at the site to achieve the objective. If only one method is available to effect some remedial measure, or no alternative measures have been considered, simply state that as the case. If possible, provide the merits and demerits of each alternative considered.

None.

6. What is the final cleanup plan, if any, for the site?

. None.

7. What mechanisms are available for funding the above closure plans?

Such funding sources include 311 monies, state fundings, private sources through Administrative Orders or consent decrees, money "volenteered" from private sources, FIT contracting or subcontracting and Superfund money.

None other than superfund.

8. What actions have been planned for the site?

These remedial/emergency activities are a subset of those indicated under question 2 and include those actions for which RFP's, IFB's, and/or TDD's have been prepared. These are activities for which the scope of work and work plans have been developed but have not been initiated.

Other than state-continued minitoring, no actions have been planned.

9. What problems are present to prevent the implementation of activities under question 8?

Such problems may include awaiting final results of a necessary study, poor weather conditions delaying construction, disallowal of 311 money for the planned activity, extended contract negotiations, lack of subcontracting money under the FIT contract, public interference, lack of acceptable disposal site and/or method. Include the anticipated time to overcome the obstacles and any actions that Headquarters could take to expedite the solution.

Funding problems prohibit solutions to the contamination problems.

10. What actions are currently underway at the Site?

A brief description of the level of activity, extent of remedy anticipated, time of completion and associated costs (if available) of such activities as State-directed cleanup, 311 actions, owner/operator and legislation.

None.

11. Have cost estimates been developed?

At best estimate of the total cost should be supplied. If at all possible the rationale behind the estimate should be provided. Also, needed, if available, are the cost estimates for each anticipated activity described under questions 3 and 4. Include the dates applicable to each of the cost estimates.

No.

12. Have time estimates been developed?

A best estimate of the total time needed to clean the site as well as times and scheduling for each phase of cleanup should be provided. Is a facility management plan available, or can one be developed? If so, please supply this information. If enforcement/legislation is underway have deadlines been established under Administrative orders or a consent decree? If so, what are they and are they being met? Has a case development plan been formulated? If so, what are the relevant dates?

No.

13. What are the important circumstances relevant to the cleanup that should be considered?

There seems to be no culpable party, the dumping was clandestine.

For instance,

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| Enforcement/litigation | - What are the prospects of getting a responsible party to affect the cleanup in an acceptable time? Is some necessary precedent being established? |
| Public Participation | - Are public interest groups actively involved? To what extent? Supply names (and telephone numbers) of people that should be contacted if the site is selected for cleanup under Superfund. |
| State Involvement | - What level of activity has the State shown in regards to the site? Should the State office be contacted directly? Who in the State office should participate? |
| Congressional Interest | - Have any State or Federal Congressman shown a substantial interest in the site? |
| Notoriety | - Have newspapers, television, activist groups publicized the site? Examples would be Love Canal, Memphis, Valley of the Drums, etc. |